

1 **REMARKS**

2 Claims 1, 32 and 44 are amended. Claims 1-14 and 32-48 remain in the
3 application. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests
4 withdrawal of the rejections and forwarding of the application on to issuance.
5

6 **Specification Objection**

7 The Office has objected to the title of the present application and suggested
8 that the title be changed. While Applicant believes that the previous title
9 sufficiently described the claimed subject matter, Applicant has amended the title
10 of the application in an attempt to comply with the Office's requirement.

11 Applicant wishes for the record to reflect that the only reason that the title
12 is being changed is because of the Office's continued insistence that it be changed.
13 The change to the title is in no way to be used to affect an interpretation of the
14 claims.
15

16 **§112, and 102/103 Rejections**

17 Claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing
18 to comply with the written description requirement.

19 Claims 1 and 3-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being
20 anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,535,920 to Parry et al. (hereinafter "Parry").

21 Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over
22 Parry in view of Official Notice taken by the Office.

23 Claims 32-36 and 38-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being
24 obvious over Parry in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,442,658 to Hunt et al. (hereinafter
25 "Hunt").

1 Claim 37 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over
2 Parry and Hunt in view of Official Notice taken by the Office.

3 4 The Rejections

5 Preliminarily, before discussing the claim amendments, Applicant wishes to
6 acknowledge the Examiner's willingness to advance prosecution in this matter by
7 suggesting claim amendments. Specifically, on page 10 under the heading
8 "Conclusion" the Examiner suggests amendments to the claims to "define the
9 scope" and "distinguish over the arts argued by applicant."

10 Applicant has adopted the Examiner's suggested amendments and,
11 accordingly, has amended claims 1, 32 and 44 to reflect the language
12 recommended by the Office.

13 However, Applicant wishes for the record to reflect that these claim
14 amendments are not to be construed as an admission of the propriety of the
15 Office's rejections. Quite to the contrary, Applicant respectfully disagrees with
16 the Office's rejections and firmly believes that the claims patentably distinguish
17 over the art cited by the Office. Nonetheless, Applicant recognizes that a
18 stalemate has been reached and that without at least some concession on
19 Applicant's behalf, prosecution will not advance short of an appeal.

20 Accordingly, Applicant has made the claim amendments below simply to
21 secure issuance of a patent so that the public may benefit and that the useful arts
22 may be advanced. Applicant reserves its right to file one or more continuation
23 applications to further pursue subject matter which, in Applicant's opinion, it is
24 clearly due.

1 **Claim 1** has been amended and recites one or more computer-readable
2 media embodying a software object for use in a media processing filter graph, the
3 software object comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- 4 • an input, coupled to a media source, to receive content from the
5 media source; and
- 6 • a dynamically determined plurality of outputs, each responsive to the
7 input and coupled to a source processing chain, to provide each of
8 the source processing chains with ***their requested respective***
9 ***disparate media type source clips*** from a single instance of the
10 media source in accordance with a user defined media processing
11 project, wherein said object is configured to ***parse the media source***
content into the respective disparate media type source clips
provided by said single instance of the media source.

12 The amendment above reflects the language suggested by the Office. As
13 the Office states on page 10 of the present Office Action that such amendment
14 would “distinguish over the arts”, this claim is allowable.

15 **Claims 2-14** depend from claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an
16 allowable base claim.

17 **Claim 32** has been amended and recites one or more computer-readable
18 media embodying a software object coupled to a source processing chain in a
19 media processing filter graph comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- 20 • a software object input, coupled to a media source, to receive content
21 from the media source;
- 22 • a dynamically determined plurality of software object outputs, each
23 responsive to the software object input and coupled to a plurality of
24 source processing chain, to provide each of the source processing
25 chains with ***their requested respective disparate media type source***
clips from a single instance of the media source in accordance with a
user defined media processing project, ***wherein said object is***
configured to parse the media source content into the respective

disparate media type source clips provided by said single instance of the media source;

- the source processing chain comprising:
 - a scalable, dynamically reconfigurable matrix switch having a plurality of inputs and a plurality of outputs;
 - at least one matrix switch input being communicatively linked with a first processing chain portion;
 - at least one other matrix switch input being communicatively linked with a second processing chain portion;
 - the matrix switch being configured to dynamically couple one or more of the matrix switch inputs to one or more of the matrix switch outputs.

The amendment above reflects the language suggested by the Office. As the Office states on page 10 of the present Office Action that such amendment would “distinguish over the arts”, this claim is allowable.

Claims 33-43 depend from claim 32 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

Claim 44 has been amended and recites a storage medium comprising executable instructions which, when executed, implement a system comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- means for coupling to a media source to receive content from the media source to provide an input;
- means for dynamically determining a plurality of outputs, each responsive to the input and coupled to a plurality of source processing chains, to provide each of the source processing chains with *their requested respective disparate media type source clips* from a single instance of the media source in accordance with a user defined media processing project, *wherein said means for dynamically determining is configured to parse the media source content into the respective disparate media type source clips provided by said single instance of the media source;*
- the source processing chain comprising:
 - a scalable, dynamically reconfigurable matrix switch having a plurality of inputs and a plurality of outputs;

- at least one matrix switch input being communicatively linked with a first processing chain portion;
- at least one other matrix switch input being communicatively linked with a second processing chain portion;
- the matrix switch being configured to dynamically couple one or more of the matrix switch inputs to one or more of the matrix switch outputs.

The amendment above reflects the language suggested by the Office. As the Office states on page 10 of the present Office Action that such amendment would “distinguish over the arts”, this claim is allowable.

Claims 45-48 depend from claim 44 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

Conclusion

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office’s next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 12/20/09

By: 

Lance R. Sadler
Reg. No. 38,605
(509) 324-9256